FIVE CENTS

The Suffragist

WEEKLY ORGAN OF THE
CONGRESSIONAL UNION FOR WOMAN SUFFRAGE

FEBRUARY 27, 1915

AT WORK IN THE CONSTITUENCIES OF MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

Scene in the New York Headquarters of the Congressional Union

Mrs. William Colt, Member of the Advisory Council of the Union, Explaining the Vote of N. Y. Congressmen on the Suffrage Amendment

Vol. III February 27, 1915 No. 9

The Suffragist

Weekly Organ of the Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

1420 F STREET N. W., WASHINGTON, D. C.

Art Editor, Mrs. Nina E. Allender

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE:

Domestic $1.00
Foreign $1.50
Single Copies .....5 cents

Checks, drafts and postoffice orders should be made payable to The Treasurer of the Congressional Union

Columbian Printing Co., Inc., Washington

35

Entered as second-class matter, Nov. 14, 1913, at the Post-Office at Washington, D. C., under act of March 3, 1879

Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

Non-Partisan

Object—

Securing an amendment to the United States Constitution, enfranchising women.

Membership—

Open to all women who, regarding woman suffrage as the foremost political issue of the day, will work without considering the interests of any national political party.

Dues—

Entrance fee of twenty-five cents. There are no other dues.

Date.....

Name .....

Full Address .....

.....

Telephone Number .....

Occupation .....

Please fill out this card and send it with twenty-five cents entrance fee to 1420 F Street N. W., Washington, D. C.

News of the Week

The "Susan B. Anthony" Memorial Fund

MRS. John Jay White has invited the members and friends of the Congressional Union to a tea at her home, Studio House, on Sheridan Circle, on Sunday afternon, February 28th, to celebrate the completion of the three weeks' campaign to raise the "Susan B. Anthony" Memorial Fund. Miss Isabella Mott, who is in charge of this work, has enlisted the services of nearly a hundred District women as members of the Campaign Committee.

At the tea a play, representing an incident in the life of Miss Anthony, by Miss Hazel MacKaye, will be read by the author. There will also be short addresses by several well-known speakers.

Eight Hour Law Upheld U. S. Supreme Court Approves California Woman Labor Act

THE California eight-hour labor law for women employed in manufacturing and mercantile establishments, except those engaged in harvesting and canning fruit, or working in boarding houses, and excepting also graduate nurses in hospitals, was upheld as constitutional today by the Supreme Court of the United States.

President Wilson and Dr. Kemp

THE *Suffragist* of August 1, 1914, called attention to the protest of the Washington Medical Society against the action of President Wilson in pardoning the son-in-law of Senator Fletcher of Florida, Dr. Thomas J. Kemp, who had been convicted of using the United States mails to secure a criminal practice among women.

It was pointed out that this was the second time President Wilson had preferred to help a political friend rather than enforce a law protecting women—the other instance being the case of the son of Inspector Caminetti of the Immigration Service, who was tried under the Mann White Slave Act.

On Saturday, February 20, Dr. Kemp was again arrested on the charge of selling morphine and cocaine, in defiance of the Pharmacy Laws of the District of Columbia. Dr. Kemp has been released on bail; and Suffragists are now wondering whether he will again receive clemency from the man who could not consider the plea of working women for enfranchisement because that matter "was not in the Democratic platform."

Presidential Suffrage

PRESIDENTIAL suffrage is now a possibility in two more states, Indiana and Vermont. The Indiana Senate has passed a limited suffrage bill, similar to that of Illinois. It is believed that the measure will pass the House also. The Governor of Indiana has already promised to sign it, if both houses pass it.

In Vermont a similar bill has passed the State Senate and is now before the House.

North Dakota Senate Recalls Suffrage Bill

BY a vote of 26 to 22 the North Dakota Senate, on February 19th, recalled from the House the Equal Suffrage Bill recently passed by the Senate.

As a motion attached when the bill passed the Senate makes necessary a two-thirds majority vote to repass the measure, it is generally believed that it will not be reconsidered this session.

The bill passed both houses two years ago and if it had been favorably acted upon at this session, it was to be submitted to the people two years hence.

Suffragists Find Trick to Invalidate New Jersey Bill

THE vigilance of the New Jersey suffragists foiled the second attempt to prevent the passage of the equal suffrage resolution in the New Jersey Legislature. It was discovered that between the time of the introduction and passage of the Peacock resolution providing for an amendment to the New Jersey Constitution to allow equal suffrage in the House of Assembly, a comma had been removed from the text of the Resolution. This possible mistake of the clerk might have invalidated the bill and sent it back for discussion before a Board of Inquiry, indefinitely postponing the passage of the resolution. The New Jersey women discovered the mistake in time to call the attention of Assemblyman Peacock of Burlington, the introducer of the resolution, to the omission.

Mr. Peacock believes the resolution to be valid, as the comma was inserted in the bill before the House passed the resolution. Had it not been for the vigilance of the suffragists, their bill would have slipped from their hands through this technicality.

Thirty-Eight German Women Decorated by Kaiser with Iron Cross

THE German Kaiser decorated thirty-eight women trained nurses, in the Ambulance Corps, with the Iron Cross for bravery and distinguished service. This is the first time in the history of Germany that the Iron Cross has been presented to women.

Suffrage in England

THE suffrage movement has by no means been suspended in England on acount of the war.

On the contrary, the war has illustrated afresh the need of English women for the ballot.

On Tuesday, February 2nd, when Parliament met, a deputation of working women went to the lobby of the House of Commons to interview Members of Parliament, and urge upon them the need for taking prompt and drastic action upon the important matters:

Votes for women.

Military and naval separation allowances and pensions.

Abolition of police supervision for soldiers' and sailors' families.

Regulation of prices and profits for freightage and commodities.

Grant of a minimum wage of 1£ a week to women employed by Government contractors and work subsidized by public funds.

Work for unemployed adults not for children of school age.

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.

Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York

SUITS COATS BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS WRAPS FURS

New Members of the Advisory Council

THE Congressional Union is happy to state that Miss Julia Marlowe, wife of Mr. Edward H. Sothern, whose addition to our membership was recently announced, has consented to join the Advisory Council as further proof of her sympathetic interest in the work of securing a Federal Amendment for woman suffrage.

It is with unusual pleasure that we welcome to our Council so distinguished a representative of a profession in which women have long played an important part.

No one could more fittingly represent the stage than Miss Marlowe, whose grace of personality and public-spirited interest in all humanitarian questions, as well as distinguished professional achievement, have won for her a unique pre-eminence in the affection and regard of the American public.

OTHER notable women who have joined the Advisory Council are Miss Clara Louise Thompson, of St. Louis, Mo., and Mrs. Gertrude Cuthbert and Mrs. Bertha W. Fowler, both of Denver, Colorado.

Miss Thompson, who is now Professor of Latin at Rockford College, Mo., is the only woman who ever won the American Fellowship at the Classical School at Rome. The winning of this fellowship was always competitive; however, after the competition was won by a woman, the honor was thereafter awarded by appointment.

MISS JULIA MARLOWE

Mrs. Bertha Fowler is President of the Woman's Political Union of Colorado and is one of the early workers for suffrage in this country. "I have a vivid recollection of Miss Anthony," Mrs. Fowler writes, "as I saw her in London at a meeting of the International Council, when we adjourned for service in Westminster Abbey, attended by Miss Anthony—her silver hair uncovered, in defiance of St. Paul. * * * A timid bishop * * * entreated us to remain 'womanly.' I turned to Miss Anthony, exclaiming, 'If we could only correct that by having *you* in the pulpit for five minutes!' Very tolerantly and tranquilly she replied, 'But he means well." * * * Well, the best one can say of her successors is that she would be very proud of them, and of the Congressional Union."

Mrs. Gertrude H. Cuthbert has a wide social influence in Denver, where a branch of the Congressional Union has been established. "I want to say right here," Mrs. Cuthbert writes, "that it was Miss Doris Stevens who brought us the 'vision,' and gave us an impetus to work as we women have never worked before. She gave us the broad outlook, the opportunity nationally."

We are proud of the growing co-operation of strong women throughout the country.

The Demand Behind the "Susan B. Anthony" Amendment

TWO suffrage amendments to the United States Constitution have been introduced in Congress and are now before it.

One of these measures was proposed by Senator Bristow of Kansas and Representative Mondell of Wyoming; the second by Senator Shafroth of Colorado and Representative Palmer of Pennsylvania.

It is obviously hurtful to women's interests to have two different suffrage proposals pressed in Congress at the same time.

The measure supported by Suffragists throughout the country is the constitutional amendment proposed by Senator Bristow and Representative Mondell. This is the measure drafted by Susan B. Anthony and Elizabeth Cady Stanton in 1875 and supported by successive conventions of Suffragists ever since that date.

The Bristow-Mondell Amendment is a simple, straightforward amendment, providing that no citizen of the United States should be disfranchised because of sex. The Shafroth-Palmer Amendment makes the curious proposal that the Constitution of the United States be so amended that state referendums on suffrage shall be instituted on petition of a certain percentage of the male electors of each state; it proposes, in other words, to establish in every state, by federal action, the referendum and initiative in regard to suffrage only.

A recent number of the *Suffragist* (February 13) has dealt with the superior simplicity and directness of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment. We submit below statements of a number of Congressmen, each a firm friend of the suffrage movement, who has testified to his belief in the political wisdom of supporting the Bristow-Mondell Amendment only.

I VERY much favor the Senate Joint Resolution 130, commonly known as the Bristow-Mondell resolution, because it provides for the national enfranchisement of women. Other bills pending localize the suffrage movement and place it within the power of the States to grant it or not, which power exists at this time. The Bristow-Mondell resolution by one enactment enfranchises the women of America and places them upon an equal footing with men in the exercise of political privileges, and I therefore favor it.

(Signed) *Joseph L. Bristow,*
U. S. Senator from Kansas.

AS between the two woman-suffrage resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution, namely, the Bristow-Mondell and that introduced by Senator Shafroth, I would prefer the former, and I believe it advisable for all friends of equal suffrage to concentrate their efforts upon that resolution, if possible.

(Signed) *Thomas Sterling,*
U. S. Senator from South Dakota.

THE Bristow resolution is identical with that recently considered, and in my judgment is the only one to be reported favorably to the Senate. It cannot be improved upon, either in phraseology or in purpose.

(Signed) *Charles S. Thomas,*
U. S. Senator from Colorado.

I CONSIDER it unwise to have the two bills, because it is likely to divide the vote, and I am therefore in favor of the Bristow-Mondell amendment, which is the most direct method of securing the enfranchisement of women.

(Signed) *Reed Smoot,*
U. S. Senator from Utah.

OF course, I am heartily in favor of the Bristow amendment and would much prefer to see it passed to any other on woman's suffrage.

(Signed) *W. L. Jones,*
U. S. Senator from Washington.

IT is unfortunate that all the forces in favor of woman suffrage cannot unite in one common effort and in the support of the resolution in Congress. I myself prefer the so-called Bristow-Mondell resolution.

(Signed) *Miles Poindexter,*
U. S. Senator from Washington.

Over Half of the People in Washington
EAT CORBY'S BREAD--WHY?

Congressional Union for Woman Suffrage

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE

Miss Alice Paul, N. J., Chairman
Miss Lucy Burns, N. Y., Vice-Chairman
Mrs. Donald Hooker, Md., Chairman Finance
Mrs. Mary Beard, N. Y.
Mrs. O. H. P. Belmont, N. Y.
Mrs. Crystal Eastman Benedict, N. Y.
Mrs. Gilson Gardner, D. C.
Miss Elsie Hill, Conn.
Mrs. Wm. Kent, Cal.
Mrs. Lawrence Lewis, Jr., Pa.

ADVISORY COUNCIL

Mrs. Harriot Stanton Blatch, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Milholland Boissevain, N. Y.
Mrs. John Winters Brannan, N. Y.
Mrs. Edward N. Breitung, N. Y.
Reverend Olympia Brown, Wis.
Mrs. Winston Churchill, N. H.
Mrs. Lillian Harris Coffin, Cal.
Mrs. William L. Colt, N. Y.
Mrs. Frank Cothren, N. Y.
Mrs. Lucius M. Cuthbert, Col.
Mrs. George H. Day, Conn.
Mrs. John Dewey, N. Y.
Miss Mary Bartlett Dixon, Md.
Miss Lavinia Dock, N. Y.
Mrs. Abigail Scott Dunniway, Oregon
Mrs. Glendower Evans, Mass.
Mrs. Bertha W. Fowler, Col.
Mrs. Charlotte Perkins Gilman, N. Y.
Mrs. Inez Haynes Gilmore, Cal.
Mrs. Edwin C. Grice, Pa.
Mrs. F. R. Hazard, N. Y.
Mrs. Phoebe A. Hearst, Cal.
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles, Del.
Mrs. Frederick C. Howe, N. Y.
Miss Ada L. James, Wis.
Miss Helen Keller, Mass.
Mrs. Florence Kelley, N. Y.
Dr. Cora Smith King, Wash.
Miss Gail Laughlin, Cal.
Mrs. William Bross Lloyd, Ill.
Miss Hazel Mackaye, Mass.
Miss Julia Marlowe, N. Y.
Mrs. Lionel S. Marks, Mass.
Miss Edythe Wynne Matthison, Conn
Miss Mary McDowell, Ill.
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith, Va.
Mrs. Mary Hutcheson Page, Mass.
Mrs. Marsden Perry, R. I.
Mrs. Annie Porritt, Conn.
Mrs. William Prendergast, N. Y.
Mrs. John Rogers, N. Y.
Prof. Lucy M. Salmon, N. Y.
Mrs. Julius Stone, Ohio
Mrs. Mary C. Therkelsen, Ore.
Miss Clara L. Thompson, Mo.
Mrs. Thomas F. Walsh, D. C.
Mrs. Mina Van Winkle, N. J.
Mrs. John Jay White, D. C.
Miss Charlotte Anita Whitney, Cal.
Mrs. Harvey W. Wiley, D. C.
Mrs. S. B. M. Young, Mont.

National Headquarters—1420 F Street, Washington, D. C.

COLORS—PURPLE, WHITE AND GOLD

Senate Resolution 130, and House Resolution 1

Proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women.

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress Assembled (two-thirds of each House concurring therein), That the following article be proposed to the legislatures of the several States as an amendment to the Constitution of the United States, which, when ratified by three-fourths of the said legislatures, shall be valid as part of said Constitution, namely:

"ARTICLE .—SEC. 1. The right of citizens of the United States to vote shall not be denied or abridged by the United States or by any State on account of sex.

"SEC. 2. Congress shall have power, by appropriate legislation, to enforce the provisions of this article."

HISTORY OF THE AMENDMENT

Introduced:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, by Senator George E. Chamberlain, of Oregon.
In the House: April 7, 1913, by Representative Frank W. Mondell, of Wyoming.

Referred:

In the Senate: April 7, 1913, to the Woman Suffrage Committee.
In the House: April 7, 1913, to the Judiciary Committee.

Reported:

In the Senate: June 13, 1913, favorable report.
In the House: May 5, 1914. Reported without recommendation.

Discussed:

In the Senate: July 31, 1913, twenty-two Senators in favor, three opposing.
September 18, 1913, Senator Wesley L. Jones, of Washington, speaks in favor of the amendment and demands immediate action.
On January 21, 1914, Senator Ashurst, of Arizona, delivered a speech urging the passage of the Amendment.
Made unfinished business, March 2, 1914.
Debated almost continuously from March 2d to March 19th.

Voted Upon:

In the Senate: March 19, 1914, thirty-five Senators in favor, thirty-four opposed, failing by eleven of the necessary two-thirds vote.
In the House: January 12, 1915, 174 in favor, 204 opposed; failing by 78 of the necessary two-thirds vote.

Reintroduced:

In the Senate: March 20, 1914, by Senator Bristow, of Kansas.

Reported:

In the Senate: April 7, 1914, favorable report

Present Status:

In the Senate: On Calendar of Senate.

Appropriations and Woman Suffrage

DURING the past week appropriation bills carrying enormous expenditures have been passed by the Senate in record time. The Pension bill was passed on Monday in exactly four minutes. The Postoffice Bill was disposed of in two hours.

Suffragists are getting accustomed to the rush of appropriations at the tail end of a session. It is positively convenient for each sucessive administration to "rush" appropriations; many items can be safely passed which would not bear scrutiny.

Women can only look on in wonder while these millions of public money, raised by levying taxes on women as well as on men, are being appropriated by a Senate too busy to consider the claim of women to their right to say how the money which they are compelled to contribute shall be disbursed.

Custom dulls the sense of shame, or the highest officials of our government would be ashamed to think of the disfranchisement of women.

The President of the United States receives at the present time $75,000 in salary, and an additional $25,000 for traveling expenses. For social expenditures he receives in his official capacity $25,000 more; and though the present President has traveled and entertained little, he receives nevertheless the customary allowance for these purposes. The appropriation bill carried last Saturday an item of $160,000 for the President's trip to the Pamana Pacific Exposition. Objection to this expenditure was made by Senator Poindexter, of Washington, on the ground that it was excessive, and he proposed that it be reduced to $80,000.

"I think," said Senator Poindexter, "the President ought to have a liberal allowance for making this trip to the Panama Exposition, but I think that $80,000 would be very ample for that purpose. * * * There does not seem to be any very complete understanding as to how the money is to be expended, but it is to be expended under certificates issued by the President, and the amendment is very explicit that it shall be on his voucher solely. * * * It (the trip) is to be upon government ships. I think any one would have a good deal of difficulty, however elaborate they might imagine this ceremony ought to be, in explaining how $160,000 could be legitimately expended in connection with it, in view of the facilities of which they will have the advantage, and which will cost them nothing. * * *

"As I was proceeding to recall, to illustrate how we slip easily and swiftly into extravagance, the salary of the President was formerly $50,000 a year, and he was allowed $25,000 a year for traveling expenses in addition to his salary; but there was always so much debate about whether he had legitimately expended the money for traveling expenses that the $25,000 was added to his salary, with the expectation that he would spend all of it, and if he did not spend all of it he would keep the balance, and there would be no question as to what he spent it for. The understanding was, however, when the salary was increased to $75,000, that he was to pay his own traveling expenses out of it. It was simply a new method of paying his traveling expenses. But, as so often happens in similar matters, we went on appropriating the $25,000 for his traveling expenses just as we had done before, notwithstanding we had added that amount to his salary for that purpose; so that these appropriation bills at present carry $75,000 for his salary and $25,000 for his traveling expenses.

"The point I am making is that, so far as the President's expenses are concerned, if there are any—and I doubt whether there will be any material expenses on his part—they should be paid out of the $25,000 which will be appropriated and is carried in the sundry civil bill now pending in the Senate. * * * I do not desire to delay the Senate; but, as I said, I heard the debate the other day and the questions asked of the chairman of the committee as to how they were going to spend $160,000 on this trip, and he was not able to answer them. * * * I do not think the President is going to have very much to do with it (the expenditure of the money). I have not the slightest idea that the President of the United States, with the problems to which he ought to be giving his attention, is going to pay any attention to the details of the entertainment of these guests at the Panama Pacific Exposition. It is going to be directed by subordinate officials, and the ordinary experience is that they will spend all the money that is available."

This mild protest was at once overborne by a vote of 40 to 16; and the item remains in the appropriation bill.

IT is difficult for women to understand the dullness of conscience which will permit high officials to accept salaries and large personal appropriations, drawn from taxes imposed with all the power of law upon women as well as men, without recognising the right of women to select the officials or control in any degree the amount of their salaries.

How could the President, facing a delegation of working women, as he has done with unruffled composure, bear to think of such appropriations, to which these working women, directly or indirectly, contribute? As the representative of free womanhood, his office would be thoroughly dignified—as an official willing to take women's money, but unwilling to give them the common equivalent of it, his position is humiliating indeed.

THE FINALITY OF FEDERAL WORK

By Helena Hill Weed

EVERY step of progress in the work for the Federal Amendment is a final step. Once the amendment has been submitted by Congress, the work cannot be stopped until success is attained. It may be retarded and our enemies may be able to prolong the struggle; but they can never take from us ground which we have once gained. In this fact lies one of the great sources of hope in Federal work.

In State work the exact reverse of this situation is true. When a state referendum is begun there are many steps to be taken, and defeat at any point means that the work must be all done over from the very beginning. The general rule of state referendums is that the question must pass two successive legislatures in some form, then be submitted to the electorate at the next general elecion. The rule varies, in the various states, as to the majorities required in the Legislatures and in the referendums, but the general plan of proceedure is the same. In the States which have their own general Initiative and Referendum Law, the Petition Campaign takes the place of the work in the Legislatures. If the bill meets defeat at any point, all the work must be done over from the very beginning.

With the Federal Amendment this is not so. A study of the history of the Constitution proves beyond controversy the finality of every favorable step and the possibility of redeeming every unfavorable step without loss of ground already gained.

SINCE the Constitution was adopted there have been twenty-one amendments submitted by Congress to the legislatures. Seventeen of these have been ratified by the requisite number of the State Legislatures and become a part of the Constitution. Four of them have been ratified by several States, but not by the requisite number.

The amendments which have been incorporated into the Constitution fall into four groups. The first group of ten were submitted by the first session of Congress and were considered and ratified by the States with the Constitution itself. They can almost be called an integral part of that document.

The second group consists of the XIth and XIIth Amendments. The XIth, which was proposed in 1794 and was declared adopted in 1798, defined the powers of the Supreme Court. The XIIth, proposed in 1803 and declared adopted in 1804, provided for the election of the President. There was practically no opposition to these two amendments, which were merely a necessary addition to the machinery of government.

The third group of amendments which was adopted was the Civil War group, the XIIIth, XIVth, and XVth Amendments.

The fourth group is the group adopted in 1913 and 1914, consisting of the XVIth and XVIIth Amendments, which provide for a federal income tax and the direct election of United States Senators.

THE questions that have arisen, as these seventeen amendments were being incorporated into the Constitution, and the decisions that have been made have settled, beyond a shadow of a doubt, many questions of amendment procedure. These questions may be divided into three groups—those relating to the time allowed for the ratification; those bearing on the right of States to withdraw a ratification, once given; and those dealing with the right of a State to reconsider an unfavorable vote and to ratify an amendment after it had been rejected. The decisions in these cases are of greatest interest to Suffragists.

The third group of amendments established the precedent that no State, having once ratified an amendment, could withdraw its endorsement. This decision was brought about by the effort of New Jersey, Oregon and Ohio to withdraw their ratification of the XIVth Amendment and by the effort of New York to withdraw its endorsement of the XVth Amendment. In all but one of these instances (that of Oregon) the endorsement was withdrawn prior to the ratification of the amendment by the requisite number of States, the contention being such that action was lawful before the amendment was incorporated into the Constitution. The Secretary of State, being in doubt as to the interpretation of the Constitution on this point, issued a certificate reciting the facts and declaring that the XIVth Amendment was adopted provided the ratification of the two states which had then attempted to recall their consent was valid. Congress immediately passed a concurrent resolution declaring that the endorsements of these States were valid, whereupon, on July 28th, 1868, the Secretary of State issued a second proclamation formally and finally declaring the adoption of the XIVth Amendment.

In the case of the XVth Amendment New York was proclaimed as one of the States which had ratified the amendment, although it attempted to withdraw its ratification prior to the proclamation of the Secretary of State.

On the other hand, the precedent was established at the same time that rejection of an amendment was not final but could be reconsidered at any time. This occurred in the case of the XIIIth Amendment, when New Jersey, which had previously rejected this amendment, reconsidered its action and ratified it. Seven similar cases occurred in connection with the adoption of the XIVth and XVth amendments. In the case of the XIVth Amendment, North Carolina, South Carolina and Georgia changed their votes from nay to yea prior to the proclamation by the Secretary of State and were included in that proclamation. In the case of the XVth Amendment Ohio reversed its unfavorable vote prior to the proclamation and was included in it.

Ames, in his study of Constitutional Amendments during the first hundred years of our legislative history, says "From the above it would seem that a State having once given its consent, the question is closed, and it cannot recall its action; but on the other hand, that a State that has rejected an amendment can reconsider its action at any time previous to the incorporation of the Amendment into the Constitution."

Considering the great obstacles now in the way of amending the United States Constitution, this decision is a wise and statesman-like one. Before the states can consider a Constitutional amendment at all, it must secure the favorable vote of two-thirds of the Senators, who represent the sovereign states, and two-thirds of the Members of the United States House of Representatives, representing the masses of the people. The amendment comes to the states, therefore, after overcoming a very searching test and with strong presumptions in favor of the popular and state demand behind it.

THE third question of vital interest to workers for the Federal Amendment is, how long is the question of ratification before the legislature once it has passed Congress?

Since the establishment of the government, Congress has submitted to the states four other amendments which have not received sufficient endorsement to be incorporated into the Constitution.

Two of these amendments were submitted along with the ten others which form group I and which were passed by Congress in 1789. One was a constitutional provision for the reimbursement of Members of Congress and the other was a provision giving slave owners a proportionate representation for their slaves. A third was an amendment submitted in 1810, prohibiting any American citizens accepting any title, decoration or emolument from any foreign power, on pain of disfranchisement and loss of citizenship. The fourth unratified amendment, which was submitted in 1861, provided that no constitutional amendment could ever be enacted which would interfere with the domestic institutions of a state, including the relations of labor or service. This, of course, was to prevent the abolition of slavery.

The possibility of further consideration of the two amendments relating to slavery was eliminated by the permanent abolition of the system. The amendment forbidding the acceptance of titles of nobility, while almost unanimously adopted by Congress in 1810, and ratified by all but one of the requisite number of states, seems to have been dropped after the war of 1812, the tremendous public agitation on this question doubtless having been allayed by the outcome of that war.

The history of the fourth of these unratified amendments is extremely interesting, as it throws some light on the length of time a state may consider an amendment submitted to it by Congress. This amendment, which passed Congress in 1789, attempted to fix the salaries of Members by constitutional enactment instead of by statutory provision, as arranged in the original Constitution. This amendment had been ratified by six states, rejected by five and apparently not acted upon by three, when the Congress passed a statute dealing with the same matter. Presumably this statutory settlement of the

1510 H Street N. W.
WASHINGTON, D. C.

J. M. Gidding & Co.
Paris Cincinnati Duluth, Minn.

Fifth Avenue and 46th Street
New York

SUITS COATS BLOUSES NOVELTIES MILLINERY GOWNS WRAPS FURS

matter was acceptable to the states, for the amendment seems to have been dropped until the year 1873—nearly a hundred years later.

In 1873 Congress passed the notorious "Grab Act," which not only raised the salaries of Members to an amount then regarded as outrageously high, but was also retroactive. A storm of protest went up all over the country and numerous and varied means were sought to rebuke Congress. The state of Ohio, acting on the well-accepted theory that an amendment once submitted to the states was always before them for ratification, and in the belief that the ratification of the amendment of 1789, already accepted by six states, was the surest means of meeting the situation, took up the old amendment and passed it through the State Senate. Congress took alarm at this action and rescinded the obnoxious "Grab Act," restoring the former scale of salaries; so the old amendment was again allowed to drop. It seemed, however, that Congress recognized the right of a state to deal with an amendment to the Constitution submitted nearly a century before.

In connection with this action of the Ohio Senate, Jameson, in his treatise on "Constitutional Conventions," maintains that once Congress has submitted an amendment to the states it does not have the power to recall it, and the amendment is before the states forever, for ratification. In this stand he is sustained by Ames, in his "History of Proposed Amendments to the Constitution," who says, as above quoted, that unfavorable action on a proposed amendment can be reconsidered at any time prior to the adoption of the amendment. Watson, in his treatise on the Constitution, also maintains that the Constitution does not prescribe the time during which the states may act on a proposed amendment. "Such a provision," he says, "might have been regarded as an attempt to force the states into a ratification, whereas it was the desire of the Convention that the action of the states should be deliberate and free from influence. * * * Who but the state can judge of what would be a reasonable time? It is for the state to ratify, and cannot the state take its own time to do it? What branch of the government can tell a state when it must ratify an amendment, in the absence of any constitutional provision on the subject?"

FROM time to time attempts have been made to limit the time during which legislatures could consider and act on amendments submitted by Congress. It has been proposed to require the first session of the next elected legislature in each State to pass upon the proposed amendment and to provide that no action of any legislature would be valid if taken more than three years after the passage of the resolution. This attempt was made in connection with the submission of the XIVth and XVth Amendments, and was doubtless suggested by the action of New Jersey upon the XIIIth Amendment.

The argument presented by Mr. Buckalew of Pennsylvania on this historic occasion was that the question ought to come directly before the voters in electing their representatives to the body that was to pass on the amendment, and that it was not fair to submit it to a body not elected with that object in view. It was claimed by Mr. Buckalew that Congress had the power to pass such regulations, that it would be wise and expedient to adopt some such rule, and that it would remove all possibility of question as to what particular legislatures could act upon it and how long the amendment was open for ratification. Congress held, however, that such a proposition was in violation of the Constitution since it proposed to select the legislature which would pass on the amendment. It was shown that of all the amendments to the Constitution, adopted previous to that time, the majority of them had been ratified by legislatures which had already been elected when the amendment was submitted and not by legislatures elected, as the proposed resolution demanded, after the submission of the amendment. It was further held that Congress had no right to say that one legally elected legislature did and another did not have a right that had been granted, without qualification, to "the Legislatures of the States" by the Constitution.

OTHER interesting points have been settled as amendments have been adopted. The question was early raised as to whether the required two-thirds majority in the two Houses of Congress was two-thirds of the whole House or only two-thirds of a quorum. In 1861 the ruling was made in the United States Senate that a two-thirds vote of a quorum was a constitutional majority and this ruling has never since been contested.

The question has also been frequently raised as to whether the signature of the President was necessary to insure the validity of the amendment. The court held, in considering the validity of the Eleventh Amendment that the signature of the President was unnecessary. President Buchanan signed the proposed amendment forbidding the abolition of slavery without causing comment, but the Senate, on having its attention called to the fact that the proposed Thirteenth Amendment had been submitted to the President for his signature, immediately passed a resolution that his signature was unnecessary and that the act should not constitute a precedent for the future. President Johnson noted that his signature to the submission of the Fourteenth Amendment was "purely ministerial." Unquestionably the President's signature is not necessary to validate an amendment.

IT is clear, then, that federal work for woman suffrage is immensely hopeful, because every step forward, once our amendment has passed Congress, is a final step. The knowledge that no unfavorable action can set us back, but that every defeat can be overcome, gives courage, hope and vim to federal workers.

PATRONAGE AND PARTY

HON. CHARLES H. BURKE, Member from South Dakota, called attention last Friday (February 19) on the floor of the House, to the power of the President over Congress. He did not hesitate to say that the President coerced the opinion of Members by his power of patronage.

"Mr. Chairman," said Mr. Burke, "no one now will dispute that the Ship Purchase bill is the President's bill; * * * in fact, that he was insisting on its passage, notwithstanding that a clear majority of the Members of this body, if they had voted their honest convictions, were against it; it was jammed, as I have already stated, through the House.

"And how was it done, Mr. Chairman? To a large extent it was done in the same manner that the veto message on the immigration bill was sustained when it was considered by the House. A representative of the administration, one of his immediate official family, and the same one in both instances, appeared at the Capitol and was very much in evidence lobbying with the Democratic Members of the House, urging them to support the wishes of the President. And why was that particular member of the Cabinet—the Postmaster General—selected to lobby with the Members in both of these cases? It is perfectly apparent why he was selected. It was because he happens to have the ear of corn. (Laughter on the Republican side.) In other words, the Democratic Members saw post-office appointments in their different districts dangling before them, and they evidently believed that if they wished to have their way with relation to these appointments it would probably be policy on their part to do the will of the administration.

"We have heard a good deal since this administration came into power about lobbying and lobbyists, but there is no influence upon legislation that is more pernicious than a Cabinet official who has much patronage to dispense using his influence with the Members of Congress upon pending measures. That this has been done by the present Postmaster General, both as to the veto of the President on the immigration bill and with reference to the ship-purchase bill, can not be denied.

"Why, Mr. Chairman, the morning after the caucus, and the day on which the shipping bill was considered, it was currently reported that the Postmaster General had communicated with somebody in the House, wanting a list of the names of the members of the Democratic Party who had stated that they would not abide by the action of the caucus of the night before. Now, I do not know whether he made that inquiry or not, but if he did, what was the significance of it? Certainly it could have but one significance, and that would be the effect that it might have upon the Members on that side of the Chamber."

THE power of party is tremendous in national affairs. It always will be as long as the President and the Cabinet officers, whom he appoints, have at their disposal a vast amount of patronage.

This method of party government was not created by women, and cannot be altered by them, as long as the great mass of women still form in this country a disfranchised class.

But women are not blind to the facts of party government—and when they ask for action from Congress, they must ask it not from individual Members of Congress, who are becoming every day more helpless, but from the party in power, which is in a position effectively to take action.

English View of American Suffrage Movement

SUFFRAGISTS have often had reason to complain of the treatment by the American newspapers of the English Militant Suffrage movement. Such trans-Atlantic misunderstanding is not, however, wholly one-sided. In the London *Nation* for January, there is some comment on the vote in the House of Representatives of January 12, which is curiously inapropos. "It is not a matter for surprise," writes the editor, "that the Suffragist effort to carry the United States Congress has failed at the first attempt. It represents an interesting, though risky change of tactics. Hitherto the cause of woman suffrage has proceeded steadily, sapping and mining its way across the map, state by state, westwards (sic). The whole West is won; the middle West is uncertain but hopeful; the Eastern States alone make a steady resistance. The process is slow, and suffragists have lately taken up the idea of inducing Congress to submit an amendment to the Federal Constitution to the entire electorate of the United States as a national issue."

The word "westwards" is evidently a slip; but ignorance of constitutional procedure alone can account for the assumption that we are endeavoring to submit the amendment to the whole electorate of the United States. The article goes on to speak of the numerical preponderance of the East and the difficulty of converting to woman suffrage "the recent arrivals among the immigrants." The *Nation* evidently see the difficulties that confront suffragists in the East, but does not comprehend the statesmanlike move which has been taken by the Congressional Union in order to circumvent these difficulties.—*Annie G. Porritt.*

CAMPAIGN THROUGH THE COUNTRY

Overflowing Mass Meeting in New York City

New York: 13 *East forty-first Street, New York City.*

Organizer: *Miss Doris Stevens.*

A GREAT audience assembled in Cooper Union in New York City last Monday demanded instant and favorable action in the Senate on the Bristow-Mondell constitutional amendment, and called upon the New York Senators Root and O'Gorman to vote in favor of it.

The meeting fell on Washington's birthday; and a fine holiday spirit prevailed throughout the evening. The hall was packed to overflowing, and enthusiasm ran high. It was one of the most spirited suffrage meetings held in New York.

Mrs. John Rogers, Jr., who presided, introduced as the speakers Miss Doris Stevens, Mrs. Florence Kelley, Mrs. Inez Milholland Boissevain, Meyer M. London, Congressman-elect for the 12th District, and Mr. Charles Edward Russell. All the speeches sounded the call to immediate action by federal amendment.

Mrs. Boissevain said, in part: "There was a time when the process of getting suffrage state by state seemed good enough; and the business of organizing and of studying politics and of trying to learn how to be a good citizen, seemed to compensate in great part for the rather slow growth of the democratic idea. But we are not content with this process any longer. We are getting impatient; and I think we have good reason to get impatient."

Mr. Meyer London said: "I think that an audience which requires argument in favor of Woman Suffrage is too stupid to be addressed. A woman is a human being, or she isn't. I think she is. She is a member of the community and bears the burden of the community. She should have a right to share in the obligations and duties of a member of the community. * * *

"It is absurd to say that this is a state issue and not a national issue. There is no such thing as a state question. There is no problem that affects the most remote corners of Texas, or the East side of New York, that does not affect the entire nation, and the entire people of the United States. It is a national problem and the nation must take it up.

MRS. JOHN ROGERS, JR.

"Of course the drafters of the Constitution were the wisest men ever born. If you want to know anything, just go to the graves where the fathers of the Constitution lie. * * * But wise as they were, able as they were, far-seeing as they were, they could not foresee the problems of today. The entire population at that time was three million. They could not foresee such problems would arise as 32,000,000 children working in factories and mills. * * *

"Shall we amend the national Constitution? Why, of course we shall. Women are not going to be slaves to a piece of paper."

Mr. Charles Edward Russell said, in closing the meeting, "I have got through with considering this matter of suffrage as an academic proposition. I will no longer plead with legislators of this country to bestow it upon us as a privilege or a boon. I demand votes for women. It is the most practical and important and overwhelming issue of these times."

The Cooper Union meeting was advertised last week by a "domino" parade and a fife and drum parade; at the head of both little bands was carried the purple, white and gold banner of the Congressional Union, demanding the passage of the Bristow-Mondell Amendment.

This meeting culminates a month of vigorous political work in New York. A large number of meetings of protest have been held in the districts of Congressmen who voted against the Mondell amendment on January 12th, and who were re-elected to the 64th Congress. Deputations have been arranged to wait upon Representatives Oglesby, Carew, Patten, Riordan, Loft, Conry, Dooling, Bruckner, Goulden and Dale, to protest emphatically against their failure to support Woman Suffrage in Congress. These deputations will greatly improve the record of the New York contingent next session.

All the other New York Congressmen have been communicated with by letter from their constituencies. Active press work has been done in the "upstate" papers.

Donations from New York State to the Suffrage Booth of the Congressional Union at the Panama-Pacific Exposition are being collected by Mrs. R. S. Adler, of New York.

Oregon

Headquarters: 613 *Eiler Building, Portland.*

Organizer: *Miss Virginia Arnold.*

I HAD an opportunity of speaking before the Grade Teachers' Association at a dinner given at the Benson Hotel on Wednesday evening. There were two hundred present. Ever since I came to Portland I have wished for this opportunity. As I told the teachers, it is a matter of pride with me that members of my own profession show an active interest in this forward movement, a movement which means the emancipation of millions of women teachers. I had the pleasure of sitting at the table with Mr. L. R. Alderman, Superintendent of Portland Schools.

Mrs. Emma B. Carroll of our Sustaining Committee gave a paper on the duty and responsibility of parents. It was excellent. We are fortunate in having such a woman as Mrs. Carroll a member of our organization.

On the same evening I spoke before the Oregon Women's Dress Club, which met in the Public Library.

Mrs. A. E. Borthwick, another member of our Sustaining Committee, has just returned from the Legislature, which is now in session at the capital, Salem. She went down in the interest of the Community Property Rights bill, and while she was there, she spread the good news of the work of the Congressional Union. I will go down some time next month and follow up her good work.

The news of the work of the Congressional Union is spreading rapidly here in Portland. Almost everywhere I go someone says, when meeting me: "I am glad to meet you, Miss Arnold. I have been hearing of the work of your organization."

Mrs. Alva Lee Stephens, who is vice-president of the Parent-Teacher Association, which has some five thousand members throughout the state, has just sent out three thousand letters asking Oregon citizens to call upon their Senators, urging them not only to vote favorably themselves, but also to work for the passage of this amendment. The letters also ask them to spread this news to their friends, far and wide, with the hope that they, too, will use their influence in behalf of the amendment. In these letters we are enclosing lists of the Senators who either voted against the bill or did not vote at all last March 19th. These letters are being sent to members of different state associations here in Portland. It is hoped that these citizens of other states may be able to bring influence to bear upon their respective Senators. The state associations we have reached so far are the following: Nebraska, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, Missouri, Indiana, New York, and also that of the Daughters of the Confederacy.—*Virginia Arnold.*

Illinois

MISS GERTRUDE CROCKER, who, under the direction of Mrs. George A. Armes, organized the deputation of Democratic women to President Wilson last January, addressed a meeting at the home of Miss Lucy Ewing, 3745 Ellis Avenue, Chicago, last Thursday, on "the Bristow-Mondell Constitutional Amendment."

Miss Crocker, who spent three months in Washington last year, studying the technique of Congressional procedure, explained most lucidly the economy and directness of federal work for woman suffrage.

California

Headquarters: *Congressional Union Booth in Palace of Social Economy, Exposition Grounds.*

Organizer: *Miss Margaret Fay Whittemore.*

Miss Whittemore has arrived in San Francisco, and is engaged in installing the suffrage exhibit. Actively assisting her are Miss Charlotte Anita Whitney, a member of the Advisory Council of the Union, and other local members.

A number of the members of Congress from California have contributed toward this exhibit, among them Senator John D. Works and Representatives Knowland, Stephens, Kent and Hayes. The booth, the only one on the Exposition grounds where suffrage will be presented, is a contribution from Mrs. William Kent, of the Executive Committee of the Union.

Treasurer's Report

Make All Checks Payable to
The Treasurer of the Congressional Union
1420 F St., Washington, D. C.
This Will Save Much Inconvenience

MRS. SOPHIE G. MEREDITH, Vice-President of the Woman Suffrage Association of Virginia, and one of the most prominent suffrage workers in the South, in sending a contribution to the Susan B. Anthony fund, writes: "How happy it would have made Miss Anthony if she only could have known that her great work was to be carried on so wonderfully and nobly by those who are now working for her amendment."

Will you not also join in this work for her amendment by giving either personal service or financial help?

CONTRIBUTIONS TOWARD $100,000 FUND FOR SECURING THE PASSAGE OF THE FEDERAL SUFFRAGE AMENDMENT

(*Fund opened December 7th, 1912. Donations, membership fees and tickets are here listed; receipts from the purely business departments of "The Suffragist" and the Literature Committee are not included.*)

LIST OF CONTRIBUTIONS FROM FEBRUARY 15 THROUGH FEBRUARY 18

Mrs. D. D. Casement	$2.00
Dr. Caroline Spencer	1.00
Mrs. Bertha K. Bartlett	5.00
Mrs. M. H. Meigs	.50
Mrs. Margaret Kessler	.50
Central Pennsylvania Woman Suffrage Association (Per Mrs. C. F. Etter)	5.00
Anonymous	6.00
Miss Ida Katzenstein, Mrs. L. W. Martin, and Mrs. George Morgan (collected)	32.00
Mrs. George Day (Collected)	24.00
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith	100.00
Miss Cornelia Treuthart	25.00
Mrs. Herbert Gardiner Lord	5.00
Wilmington, Dela., Equal Suffrage Association	5.00
Mrs. Elizabeth Stirlith	3.00
Mrs. Irving Warner	3.00
Miss Louise Stassfort	2.00
Miss Elizabeth Speakman	5.00
Mrs. Victor du Pont, Sr.	7.00
Nevada Equal Franchise Society	5.00
Mr. Joshua Conner	5.00
Mrs. Haddock	1.00
Mrs. Fred Bringhurst	1.00
Mrs. J. A. Cranston	6.00
Mrs. Elizabeth Fairlamb	.25
Mrs. Florence Bayard Hilles	25.00
Miss Caroline M. Cooper	10.00
Miss Margaret Shearman	4.00
Miss Annie Flinn	1.00
Mrs. A. V. Sergeant	2.00
Mrs. J. A. Melvin	2,00
Mrs. R. H. Richards	5.00
Mrs. Cofield	2.00
Miss Clara Dill	2.00
Mrs. Mary Hearn	3.00
Susan B. Anthony Fund, Per Miss Isabelle Mott, Chairman.	
Mrs. Alice Durand Edgerton	1.00
Miss C. J. Belden	1.00
Miss Joy Young (Collected)	5.00
Miss Shirley Putnam	.50
Miss Helen Buchanan	1.00
Miss Elsie Hill (Collected)	1.50
Mrs. C. C. Farrar	1.00
Mrs. Emma Estabrook	2.00
"M. T. H."	1.00
Miss Emma F. Baxter	1.00
Mrs. Breckons	2.00
Miss Eliza H. Lord (Collected)	1.15
Mrs. Virginia White Speel	1.00
Miss Annie E. Dolan	2.00
Mrs. Sophie G. Meredith	2.00
Miss Marion Thorwarth (Collected)	5.00
Irma Irwin Poppler	1.00
Collections	5.34
Membership fees	4.00
Sale of tickets	3.00
Total	$346.74
Previously acknowledged in *The Suffragist*	55,836.18
Total through February 18th	$56,182.92

One Thousand New Subscribers

I PRIZE your paper highly as a weekly incentive to suffrage endeavor and wish you success." So writes one of the Massachusetts readers of the *Suffragist*. Will you not help in the extension of this interest by securing readers in neighborhoods where the paper is not yet known?

Members Who Have Secured New Subscribers

FEBRUARY 15 TO FEBRUARY 22

(*In this column we list the subscribers sent in each week by our members. These are only a part of the total number of new subscriptions.*)

Miss Ruth Astor Noyes	1
Mrs. George H. Day	2
Mrs. John Dewey	5
Mrs. Mabel Wing Castle	1
Mrs. C. C. Farrar	1
Mrs. William L. Colt	1
Mrs. Albert Caesar	2
Miss Doris Stevens	4
Miss Gertrude Crocker	1
Mrs. James Whittemore	1
	19
Previously acknowledged in *The Suffragist*	578
Total to February 22d	597

The Committee of One Hundred

BELIEF in the methods and policy of the Congressional Union and a widespread desire to continue its activities along its present lines of work are evidenced by the rapidly increasing membership of the Committee of One Hundred, of which Mrs. William Kent, of California, is chairman. This committee is organized to raise the funds necessary to maintain the Washington Headquarters of the Union and thus make possible a continuation of its active political work for securing the submission of the Susan B. Anthony Amendment.

Among the recent additions to this committee are Mrs. Ackerman, President of the Bronxville, New York, Suffrage Association; Mrs. William Prendergast, wife of the Comptroller of New York City, and a prominent member of the Woman Suffrage Party of New York City; Miss Margaret Whittemore, of Detroit, Michigan, Secretary of the Wayne County Suffrage League; Mrs. Cora Haynes and Miss Jessie Anthony, of Los Angeles, California; Mrs. Paul F. Johnson, of Milwaukee, Wisconsin; Mrs. W. F. Dowell, of Philadelphia; Mrs. Gertrude B. Newell, of Brookline, Massachusetts; Miss Bliss Finley, of Washington; Mrs. Richard Wainwright, wife of Admiral Wainwright; Mrs. Rosella S. Bayhi, of New Orleans, Louisiana; Miss Alice H. Moran, of the Law Department of the University of Pennsylvania; Mrs. Donald R. Hooker, President of the Just Government League of Maryland; Miss Hortense W. Freshour, of Greenfield, Ohio; the Misses Miller, of Spencerville, Maryland; Miss Caroline Katzenstein, Executive Secretary of the Philadelphia Equal Franchise Society; Miss Lucy Ewing and Mrs. J. R. Harbeck, of Chicago; Miss Lizzie Gray, of Little Compton, Rhode Island; Mrs. Edwin C. Grice, of Philadelphia, President of the Home and School League of that city; Mrs. C. D. Robinson, of San Rafael, California; Miss Fanny Cochran, a member of the Philadelphia Committee of the Congressional Union; Miss Edith Poole, of New Britain, Connecticut; Mrs. William Albert Wood, of Philadelphia; Miss Harriet Bain, of Kenosha, Wisconsin; Mrs. John P. Treadwell, of Norwalk, Connecticut, and Miss Louise Lewis, of Philadelphia.

Telephone Main 673
Lanman Engraving Co.
HALF TONES, ZINC ETCHINGS
PROCESS ENGRAVERS
POST BUILDING Washington, D. C.

Phone Main 8384 Toilet Articles
GERTRUDE CLEMENS
Expert Shampooing and Hairdressing
Room 232 Oxford Building, 726 14th Street N.W.
Manicuring—Hair Work Facial and Scalp Treatment
Open Evenings Until Seven

DR. MARY WALKER EATON
Osteopathic Physician
Specializing in WOMEN'S and CHILDREN'S DISEASES
THE KEDRICK
Telephone Main 8336 1801 K Street N. W.
Office and Resident appointments any hour

Printing of Quality
Extra Floor Space March 1—an Entire Floor—Better Facilities —same Top-notch C-P-Co. Service—"We Grow 'Cause We Know"
COLUMBIAN PRINTING CO., Inc.
815 Fourteenth Street

ONE of our Leading Suffragists says "COLONIAL CANDIES" are the best in Washington at any price
TRY OUR FAMOUS BUTTER CREAMS
All home made candies 40c the pounds. Bring this ad and we will give to the cause one cent on every pound sold. (Packages carefully packed for parcel post delivery)
1421 F Street N. W.—908 New York Ave. N. W.
Washington, D. C.

"THE BUSY CORNER"
S. Kann Sons & Co.
8TH ST. AND PENNA. AVE.
OPEN 8:30 A. M.—CLOSE 5:30 P. M.

JET SEQUIN TRIMMING
One of the Most Popular of the Moment
Nearly all women have a weakness for jet trimming. It can express both the serious and the sparkling moods of the wearer in its brilliant darkness. All the new ways of using jet have their showing here.
JET SEQUIN FLOUNCING, about 27 inches wide, at a yard, $5.79 and.. $5.95
NARROWER FLOUNCING, designed for making bodices and for trimmings, at a yard, $1.50 to $2.95
JET SEQUIN BANDINGS, from ½ to 4 inches wide, at a yard, 15c to.... $3.00
JET CHAIN TRIMMING for festoon effects; a yard, 39c to..... 59c
JET TASSELS AND PENDANTS, the single tassel or ornament, priced from 10c to..... $1.69
Trimming Store—Street Floor.